

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/660,350

Applicant(s)

XUMU, ZHANG

Examiner

Jean F. Vollano

Art Unit

1621

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

## All Participants:

(1) Jean F. Vollano.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) V. Alexanian.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 4 March 2004

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*all*

Prior art documents discussed:

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Jean F. Vollano  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicant to tell him that the parent document US 6,653,485 seemingly had some non elected structures in the patent. After a discussion and review of the original claims Mr Alexanian believes that a certificate of correction was sent in for the problem. Applicant believes that the non elected subject matter was canceled but printed anyway. Applicant also wanted to discuss the present divisional application. We discussed the claims in the present application 10/660,350 after some discussion and review of the claims the examiner agreed to limit the claims to 4 groups per discussion and applicant chose the groups wherein Y is a bond or CH<sub>2</sub>. All the claims presented will be searched to the extent that they read on the elected invention.